



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

In the Report referred to above the preparation for the lesson is dealt with at some length; here we find the answer to the question frequently put as to how this method would be used in reading Caesar or Cicero. According to the Report the reading lesson is divided into four sections: *Praeparatio*: Caesar's words (from the *Lectio*) arranged in short simple sentences; *Lectio*: a portion of the Helvetian War (simplified to suit the exact stage the boy had reached); *Interrogatio*: questions in Latin on the *Lectio* to be answered *viva voce* in Latin, first with the book open, then with it shut; *Grammatica*: grammatical drill on the points arising in the *Lectio*.

Much can be done to inspire interest by the introduction of songs and other devices. We are familiar with these in the recent teaching of Modern Languages; there is much larger material for such devices in Latin than most of us realize. Thus, not only have many modern songs been translated into Latin, but many of the Mother Goose rhymes have Latin forms and the ingenuity of the teacher could add to the list easily. There are besides, of course, the well known Latin student songs which even pupils in the High School ought to learn. Some of these songs are printed in the report referred to above; they were used, however, apparently for purposes of diversion rather than for definite exercises.

These are only the chief things to be found in this report. There are also various suggestions concerning small points and warnings against certain pitfalls which experience has shown to lurk in the path of the inexperienced.

It remains to add that the Second Annual Meeting of the School for the Reform of the Teaching of Latin, held last September, was even more successful than the first. The next meeting will be held at Cambridge, England. G. L.

### THE DIRECT METHOD IN LATIN TEACHING<sup>1</sup>

The unrest which pervades everything at the present day, giving the student of political science never a chance to draw a long breath, has not passed education by. It has spread through every department of our school and college systems, but perhaps it is most pronounced just now in its relation to the secondary school and its curriculum. A commercialized country is bound to train its future citizens in such a way that they shall most ably perform the duties put upon them as members of a commercial community.

A very short time ago, comparatively, men felt they had more time for interest in things apart from their daily labors, and some of these avocations, at least, might involve real work, though of another sort from that which made their daily

bread. Now the fever of competition has seized upon nearly everyone: and after the struggle of the day only the purest relaxation, involving no mental effort whatever, will serve. That tends to mean that things of a purely cultural value have been pushed into the background.

Moreover, secondary education is no longer for a comparatively selected minority—it is open to nearly everyone—and those with no traditions behind them in the matter of purely cultural interests have come to be the majority whose voice must be heard—certainly everywhere in the public High Schools. These men, powerful through numbers, and reinforced by many who have had the 'higher education' and degrees in Arts following a course of free electives, freely cast aside the old traditions. For them, each subject, and the method of teaching it, must be tested entirely by the *present* view-point of the average man. Nor is this likely to be otherwise for some time to come.

Now the first thing the average man sees to arrest his attention in a High School course in these days is the study of foreign languages. What is their value at the present time to the boy who at the end of his three or four years' course will go out into business, or who, if he goes to an institution of higher learning, will drop the foreign language after another year of it? For, as far as numbers go, the great majority of our pupils come into one of these two classes. Aside from the few who will specialize, the courses for beginners in foreign languages in the Colleges give in much less time the foundation for reading courses there. And, anyhow, the demand is nowadays that the High School shall be the people's College; that its primary function shall not be to prepare students for more advanced formal study, but for life.

The observer sees the study of French and of German—or he did see it until very recently—aiming to give pupils power to read easy books in those languages: owing to the close kinship in structure and in vocabulary between these languages and English, he saw a reasonable degree of success attained. Grammar was a means to an end, and nothing more: some conversation was attempted, but, generally speaking, the results in that particular direction could be much better secured in a few weeks of a system having that special end in view than in years in a High School. The modern language teachers are changing all that now: but more of that a little later.

In Latin the observer saw the conditions even worse: the main object was to enable a pupil at the end of four years to translate from memory passages selected from the first four books of Caesar's Gallic War, Cicero's Manilian Law, Archias and the four Catilines, and the first six books of Vergil's Aeneid. To give the study the semblance of reality, the Latin Grammar was learned—such part of it as

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read at the Sixth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Philadelphia, May 4, 1912.

was contained in the Beginners' Book perhaps thoroughly—but always formally—and 'composition', which most of the pupils always hated—was used as a means of fixing grammatical principles, and perhaps making easier the memorizing of the Latin text. As the main stress was put on the translation of Latin into English—*where* it ought to be, indeed, but not *as* it ought to be—the average boy got that translation from a source which he knew was reasonably correct—the publications of Bohn or of Hinds and Noble—and in the main took a chance on the other things.

Now this condition has been partly remedied by the insistence on power to translate 'unseen Latin', but the man in the street does not yet see the emphasis placed as it should be, nor does he see the practical results which he demands if he is to support the study of Latin in the High Schools. He says that the vaunted mental discipline is in large measure lost when translation becomes mere memorizing: and for that matter he denies that 'mental discipline' as a thing in itself exists at all.

The boy who studies a language naturally asks: what good will it do me? What shall I get out of it? We have to answer him in a way more satisfactory than that which has characterized our answers in the past. We offer him primarily a training in translation which will give him a certain nicety in the use and appreciation of his own language: this training will apply not only to language-structure, but to language symbols—to vocabulary as well as to syntax: and it will throw much light not only on his English, but on any other modern language he may need to know. Beyond that, he gets occasional glimpses of the ancient world through the subject-matter of his reading—rarely, he may understand a bit of Latin he may encounter in other connections. In the higher realm, 'we want our pupils to acquire a new soul by penetrating into a new realm of thought': that is, a little of the spirit, and the enjoyment a real knowledge of Latin brings.

The pupil has a right to demand that we shall give him these things in a way which shall produce the maximum of efficiency with the minimum of waste. To get him so that he can remember the English for a passage of Caesar or Cicero or Vergil he has been drilled on will not produce this result. The only way we can do it is to put Latin into him—both the substance and the spirit. And the only way we can put it in effectively is to present the substance so that he will like it, and to surround him with the spirit during all the time at our disposal.

That leads to the specific consideration of the Direct Method. It is nothing new: a teacher as far back in time as Comenius enunciates this principle: "Omnis lingua usu potius discitur quam praeceptis, id est audiendo, legendo, relegendo, imitationem

manu et lingua temptando". In certain English schools it has been in use for a long time: and the name of Dr. W. H. D. Rouse is familiar as representing a successful solution of the initial problems that confront us. In this country it has been tried in various isolated ways and places with varying success: and I hope to be able to prove to you that where it seems to have failed, the fault lies not in the method, but in the fact that so few of our teachers are trained in such a way as to enable them to make proper use of it.

Many teachers can teach in the old way: here and there one can teach in that way and make the subject of tremendous educational value: a reasonably large number can teach for examinations as they are now set, though not as many as could do so before the recent change which made sight translation of so much more prominence: possibly the fact that almost anybody with a college education is supposed to be able to teach Latin in the old humdrum fashion has something to do with the fact that our results are far from satisfactory to us. If I can prove that the Direct Method is better than the old, I think you will agree with me that it is not only worth while, but imperative, to train a generation of teachers who *can* handle that method. To say we haven't the teachers now may be all right: but to let it go at that is a far different matter.

Our modern language friends—though, as I have intimated, they are really not the pioneers, but we are—are rapidly adopting the Direct Method. They have seen that the old way, based upon mechanical methods of teaching Latin, will not hold their pupils, nor produce results. Their basic principles, as enunciated by my colleague, Dr. C. A. Krause, joint editor of the Walter-Krause German series of textbooks, are five: (1) Insistence upon good pronunciation, (2) Oral work, (3) Inductive teaching of grammar, (4) Genuine reading, (5) Realia. They have the advantage over us in being able to use at the outset subject-matter which belongs to the pupils' everyday life, and which at the same time will be of value in their future reading. We have a great advantage over them in the way we can handle our changing word-forms at the start. They are further in advance of us in that they insist on slow drill, intensive rather than extensive work: and in that they admit that the preliminaries should occupy two years.

Before I go on to make some suggestions I have as to the teaching of Latin by the Direct Method, let me clear the air by defining it as exactly as I can. The whole plan has suffered much at the hands of critics because it has been confused with other ways of teaching language, ways which give neither the drill of the old nor the power of the new. One of these is the Conversational Method, which, though valuable as far as it goes, stops with the

idea of giving the pupil the power to say and to understand interesting things connected with his daily life. There is no drill in it, and no analysis. The Oral Method is another: for if that is followed strictly as its name implies, the practices of seeing and of writing—both extremely valuable—are lost sight of. 'Rational Method' means whatever its sponsors choose to make it mean: it is nothing more than 'sensible method': and the interpretation of that phrase is entirely a subjective matter.

The Direct Method is simply what its name indicates—it is the teaching of the language directly through the language itself: the old way teaches mainly *about* Latin. The difference may be made clear by taking up the separate phases of the subject. First, we want to create a Latin atmosphere: we talk to the pupils—at first, of course, only in sentences of a word or two—a great deal in Latin: before very long an average class can understand without difficulty the things the teacher says: and with a class in the third year I have found it feasible, even though that class had had the old way of teaching for their first two years, to say practically everything I had to say to them in Latin only, without the use of English: and their answers showed that they knew what I said—almost every word. With a class of beginners the interest is well kept up in this way, with *Salve* as a beginning, and a rapid advance to expressing in the Latin the various acts of a teacher (and then of a pupil) in class: *Surgo, ianuam claudo, fenestram aperio*, and so on. If they start this way, the members of the class soon acquire for themselves a considerable power of speech.

This is the natural way to learn forms. The changes in the personal endings are learned at the outset, by use. *Surgo, surgis, surgit, surgimus, surgitis, surgunt* become very simple for the pupils when the action is suited to the word in each case: and many other words illustrating ordinary class-room activities follow easily. In the matter of declension, such general facts as that the accusative singular of masculines and feminines ends in *m*, that neuter nominatives and accusatives in the plural end in *a*, and so on, furnish abundant material for sentences.

The unnatural breaking up of words into separate declensions and conjugations is displaced by the plan of taking all the kinds of forms of one case and number at the same time—the way an accusative looks and the way it is used come together, not in pieces, little by little. For example, let us take the direct object, in the singular: *Cretam teneo; Librum habeo; Rem pulchram video; Tonitrum audio; Parietem nigram spectro*. And so on with many illustrations. Then the Fifth Declension, over in the middle of the book, does not seem a strange and posthumous sister to Coeus and Ence-ladus. If it is objected that we must leave the

Caesar vocabulary, I reply that the number of non-Caesian words we need is in the aggregate not so appallingly great: the interest we gain more than makes up the difference; furthermore, there are other points bearing on the subject which I shall mention a little later.

This drill illustrating the forms is continued day after day: the same case is treated until it is thoroughly familiar: the new element each day is additional words, or, far better, word-groups: for we do not often think in terms of isolated words. These word-groups deal with matters of natural interest to the pupil: he will learn what he wants to know. The development of paradigms, then, is slow: and the study of formal syntax comes late, even as far on as the third year.

After this development of forms is well under way, the words used dealing with things in the room, and matters of daily interest, there should come a great deal of memorizing of Latin in the form of short poems, modern versions in Latin of familiar verses, stanzas from Horace, best of all those that may be sung, such as *Integer Vitae*. If these are of such a nature that their material will help directly in the learning of the forms, so much the better. If not, they are Latin, they are known with absolute exactness, and their meaning is exactly known: they form a part of the stock equipment of the pupil, and go a long way toward enabling him to get at the meaning of what he reads later on.

When all the noun forms have been developed, there is a device consisting of sets of model sentences, in fives, illustrating in a series the use of the five cases. For example: *Puer librum videt. Pueri librum puella videt. Puero librum magister dat. Puerum puella spectat. A puero librum magister capit*. Naturally a great variety is possible here, both in the words illustrated, and the case-uses set forth: this leads, in one more step, to the making of paradigms, to be stored in the mind for reference. In this kind of drill, chorus-work is very valuable: properly conducted, it gives the whole class a share in the proceedings, it helps the backward, and it gives a spirit in the class which is of very great value. Of course it is fatal to carry the chorus work so far as to destroy the interest of the individual.

The habit of making mistakes is one of the most discouraging things which a pupil can come to possess: therefore the oral work on any given topic should give place to written work only after the subject has been so thoroughly learned that mistakes are improbable. By the time a thing has been seen wrong half a dozen times there is an impression on the mind which is pretty hard to dislodge. For at least the first two years of the course, the class-room is the place for all new work. There is all too little teaching in Latin classes, and too

much lesson-hearing: the right sort of drill under a teacher for half an hour is worth twice as much time spent at home in the misty stretches of new fields. The work done at home should be plain memorizing and a fixing of the work done in class.

This method means the constant repetition of the *same thing*: it takes time, and it should mean thoroughness: it also means the postponement of a lot of formal grammar, both in matters of etymology and of syntax, until a late time. Half the material in many of our Beginners' Books is forgotten long before it can be put to any practical use. The inductive teaching of the grammar, to which I have pointed all along, will do away with this. Let the pupil see the various phenomena over and over again: and *only then* let him make his paradigms and memorize them if you will.

I would put the reading of Caesar as far away from the beginning of things as may be: stories down to the pupils' range of thought—fairy tales, fabulae faciles, stories from Roman history and mythology belong in the first two years. As one writer aptly says: "He (the teacher of German) does not in the second year put his pupils into Schiller's Revolt of the Netherlands, and in the third year into Goethe's Faust". Half a year is enough for Caesar, and the fifth term is early enough. Latin is hard to read: and we do not make it any easier by throwing the pupil in over his head too soon.

Let me restate in topical form what I believe to be the essential points in the teaching of Latin by the Direct Method: (1) Abundant oral Latin, by teacher and by pupils, to create an atmosphere and stimulate an active vocabulary; (2) Verbatim memorizing of Latin verses, giving the pupil a sense of a definite, usable, fund of material; (3) Grammar taught inductively by the 'case-method', with model sentences, followed *at the end* by the paradigms; (4) Lessons taught in the class: only memorizing for home study: writing *follows* speaking; (5) Reading matter for two years consists of abundant easy Latin, dealing with the pupils' natural interests.

I do not advocate the old-fashioned Inductive Method, save as it applies to the learning of forms, and later of syntax: but I think that the memorizing of sets of forms, and set rules, for the beginner, is on a pedestal from which the present time is none too soon to throw it down. As a matter of fact, a large amount of the hashing of the text for purposes of grammatical analysis, which in some class-rooms entirely overshadows the true aim of teaching Latin, is due to one thing, and one alone: that is, the fear of the printed translation. The printed translation has done and is doing more to bring the study of the Classics into disrepute than all other agencies together: but the grammar device is far from being the best way to meet the evil.

We teachers of the Classics are very conservative, and it is true there is abundant need of conservatism

in these days: too much, however, means not only stagnation, but retrogression. There are too many enemies afield to make it safe for us to leave any stone unturned to find the best ways of teaching our subject.

Since we have been feeling our way in the Direct Method in the Jamaica High School, the testimony of the pupils is overwhelmingly in its favor: they say they understand much more clearly the things they learn, the why and the wherefore of the whole matter; that they enjoy it more there is no doubt whatever. The comparison of the two methods, as applied to the same pupils, is possible, of course, only with those supposed to be duller, who failed in their first trial the term before, with the old way. But if we can get their interest, and really teach them something, is not that exactly the thing we want? Bright pupils will learn in spite of dull methods.

I earnestly hope the time is not far distant when the anachronistic hysteron proteron of grammar *before* reading and speaking will perish as it should. To quote a writer who twenty-five years ago showed rare insight in this matter: "While we gaze with rapt attention and drink in the beauty of the Venus of Milo, is our delight enhanced by remembering that the marble is made of calcium oxide and carbonic acid gas?"

EDWARD C. CHICKERING.

HIGH SCHOOL, Jamaica, New York City.

### CORRESPONDENCE

Professor Kent's review of Burton's Latin Grammar in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* (5.154-156, 162-164) is not likely to be read understandingly by any but a very few experts. Reference is made to about 200 paragraphs, which must be looked up in order to understand the criticisms, and thus the mere reading of the review is a matter of hours.

The mention of so large a number of sections is likely to give the impression of a mass of errors. However, it should be noted that forty or more of the paragraphs named are especially commended, another forty or more are criticised for things that might be termed non-essential, as including cross-references, adding illustrations, omitting some points as too learned, changing arrangement, changing hyphens, etc.

Of the remaining sections opinions would differ, criticisms being "largely subjective", as the reviewer himself says.

I venture an opinion on two paragraphs of Professor Kent's review.

(1) In his first paragraph on clearness he quotes Professor Burton's statement as to endeavoring "to present the essentials with the greatest possible simplicity for the benefit of the younger pupil", and then points out nineteen sections from various parts of the Grammar which he says are not clear. Seven